

Remarks

1. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed November 30, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 8-9, 11, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,212 (Weber et al.). Further, the Examiner rejected claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,778,304 (Grube et al.).

2. Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 11 and has added new claims 40-43. Now pending in this application are claims 8-9, 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-43, of which claim 11 is independent.

3. Response to Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 8-9, 11, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Weber et al. Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Applicant has amended independent claim 11. As amended, claim 11 clearly distinguishes over Weber et al. because Weber et al. fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of this claim. At a minimum, for instance, Weber et al. fails to teach or suggest: “the device *receiving from a first entity* a control signal associated with the given location and the device *responsively requesting a second entity* for a set of alternative control logic to be executed by the device when the device receives the ring signal,” as recited in claim 11. (Emphasis added).

With respect to independent claim 11, at best, Weber et al. teaches: (i) receiving mode change information transmitted from a base station, and (ii) changing an operation mode of the

mobile terminal depending on the received mode change information. (See, e.g., Weber et al., Col. 2, lines 37-38 and lines 43-45). However, Weber et al. does not teach or suggest a method that includes the device receiving a control signal from a first entity and responsively requesting a second entity for a set of alternative control logic to be executed by the device, as recited in claim 11.

Applicant submits that claim 11 is allowable because Weber et al. does not teach each and every element of claim 11 as required, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), to anticipate this claim. Further, because claims 8-9, 16-17, 33, and 40-43 depend on allowable claim 11 and necessarily include all of the limitations of claim 11, claims 8-9, 16-17, 33, and 40-43 are allowable as well.

4. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 8-9, 11, 16-17, 33, and 40-43 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: January 27, 2006

By: David L. Ciesielski
David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432